32

## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION IV ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION 960 COLLEGE STATION RD. ATHENS, GA 30613

3 2 1253

3425

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 24, 1992

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Groundwater Analytical Results (Sampled

January and June, 1985) from Olin Chemicals Site,

McIntosh, AL

FROM: Gary Bennett, Chemist James Genute

haboratory Evaluation and Quality Assurance Section

): Doug McCurry, Chief

HORA Permitting Section

Cafice of RCRA and Federal Facilities

THEO: Wase Knight, Chief LAK

Laboratory Evaluation and Quality Assurance Section

The have attempted to determine the reliability of the data and the applicability of the methods used for the analysis of Appendix VIII compounds as requested in your December 19, 1991 removandum for the subject analyses.

We would offer the following comments based on a review of the document submitted:

- 1. The analytical methods as described in the document appear to be appropriate for the analysis of the Appendix VIII compounds.
- 2. All volatile organic analyses met recommended holding times. All samples for cemi-volatile analyses were extracted from 11 26 days after sampling, whereas the maximum recommended holding time is 7 days. All samples for pesticide analyses were extracted more than 26 days after sampling except for sample 36560 which was extracted more than 60 days after sampling maximum recommended holding time 7 days). All herbicide samples were extracted more than 60 days after sampling with a recommended holding time of 7 days.

1. The confidence provided to not contain complete to be a selected for the confidence performed. The following items detail the missing information:

- Three is no supporting raw data for any of the metals, cyanide, or any analytes determined by HPLC.
- For the pesticide and herbicide analyses, gas chromatograms were provided but there were no retention time windows to determine if the sample peaks eluted within the correct retention times.
- The gas chromatography/mass spectral analyses (volatile and semivolatile compounds) did not contain internal standard area counts for comparative purposes.

To summarize, we were not able to perform a full data validation for the document provided due to some missing information. However, based on data review guidelines established for holding times in the Contract Laboratory Program, we can make some the following statements regarding the data. All semivolatile analyses and pesticide analyses (except for sample G6560) would be considered as estimated quantitations due to holding times being exceeded. All non-detected pesticide results for sample G6560 and non-detected herbicides results would be rejected under the data review guidelines due to the length of time which elapsed between sampling and extraction.

The document provided for review is being returned. Please contact me at FTS 250-3287 if you have any questions.

Attachment

cc: Bokey/Hall/Cosgove w/o attachment